



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

17

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,408	04/06/2001	Kevin P. Nasman	3197-000012	6009

27572 7590 12/05/2003

HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

KASENGE, CHARLES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2125

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/827,408

Applicant(s)

NASMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Charles R Kasenge

Art Unit

2125

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al. U.S. Patent 6,289,267. Referring to claims 1, 10, 20, 31, and 32, Alexander discloses a method of monitoring a power delivery system (col. 1, lines 8-15) comprising the steps of: providing a power generator which generates an output power (col. 3, lines 60-65), a sensor for detecting at least one parameter of the power delivery system (col. 4, lines 51-60), and a controller for receiving input from the sensor and providing control signals to vary operation of the power generator (col. 7, lines 2-5); monitoring a plurality of parameters associated with the power delivery system (col. 11, lines 31-42); and applying a set of rules to the parameters to determine a state of operation of the power delivery system (col. 4, lines 3-6).

Referring to claims 2, 3, 13, 21-24, and 34, Alexander discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of defining a set of rules of operation based upon the parameters associated with the power delivery system (col. 6 and 7, lines 62-67 and 1-2). Alexander discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of signaling fault conditions of the power delivery system in accordance with an outcome of the step of applying the set of rules to the parameters (col. 6 and 7, lines 62-67 and 1-2).

Referring to claims 4-6, 14, 15, 25-28, and 35-38, Alexander discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the step of monitoring the parameters further comprises the step of collecting historical data on the parameters and defining at least one condition for at least one parameter based on the historical data (col. 2, lines 38-48), and the step of applying the set of rules to the parameters applies the set of rules to the at least one condition (col. 2 and 3, lines 61-67 and 1-7). Alexander discloses the method of claim 4 wherein the step of defining the at least one condition further comprises the step of utilizing one of a fuzzy logic system and a neural network system to define the at least one condition (col. 49, lines 13-27). Referring to claim 6, Alexander discloses the method of claim 4 wherein the step of defining the at least one condition further comprises the step of defining a range wherein if a parameter falls within the range, the condition for the at least one parameter is acceptable (col. 3, lines 36-43 and col. 4, lines 1-2).

Referring to claims 7-9, 16-19, 29, and 30, Alexander discloses the method of claim 4 wherein the step of defining the at least one condition further comprises the step of modeling physical outcomes in accordance with selected parameters (col. 4, lines 30-42). Alexander discloses the method of claim 4 further comprising providing an expert system to receive the rules and the at least one condition, wherein the expert system indicates a failure mode criteria in accordance with the application of the rules to the conditions (col. 17, lines 39-51). Alexander discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the parameters (col. 1, lines 8-15) include at least one of the group of power conversion efficiency, operating hours of the power delivery system, output actuation of the power delivery system, component temperature, ambient temperature (col. 54, lines 3-11), humidity, particle contamination, communications link error rate, response characteristic, drift in input power, drift in output power (col. 34, lines 26-33), number of contact

Art Unit: 2125

cycles, number of thermal cycles (col. 32 and 33, lines 65-67 and 1-23), number of transients, feedback, and trends in parameter values (col. 15, lines 21-33).

Referring to claims 11, 12, 33, and 39, Alexander discloses the power delivery system of claim 10 wherein the system monitor indicates a warning in accordance with the state of operation of the power delivery system (col. 15, lines 8-20). Alexander discloses the power delivery system of claim 10 wherein the system monitor further comprises a database for collecting data on the parameters input to the system monitor (col. 16, lines 28-41).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles R Kasenge whose telephone number is 703 305-8592. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on 703 308-0538. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305-3900.

CK
December 1, 2003



LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100